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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript studies an instrument of patient centered care to people with intellectual disabilities. It is well written, timely and interesting. However, I have a few comments to the authors.

Background.

The authors introduce patient-centered care as more important than previously. There are a lot of missing information about the policy and knowledge that gives understanding to the first sentence. I would like to find an expanded rationale for the PCC.

Since the PCC has not been explored in the services for people with ID, the authors could describe some of the areas of successful implementation for the tool.

Methods.

A little more information about the setting would be needed to understand the level of functioning and needs of the clients.

The control group of professional carers have not been described in the methods.

Results

The results are well described. Table 5 should include the number of professionals and caregivers that was compared

Discussion

The problem of a low response rate has not been discussed. a comment that PCC is studied in an institutionalized setting is also needed as the caring ideal to PWID is community based non-institutional.
Some minor revision of this manuscript would make it even more interesting.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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